

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/603,439	SHAYLOR ET AL.
	Examiner J. Derek Ruttens	Art Unit 2192

All Participants:

Status of Application: Allowable

(1) J. Derek Ruttens.

(3) _____.

(2) Shun Yao, Reg. No. 59,242.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 8 March 2007

Time: 1:15 pm

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

103(a), 101, 112

Claims discussed:

1, 7, 10, 12, 23, 34

Prior art documents discussed:

Merrick

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See *Continuation Sheet*

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Rutten contacted Mr. Yao to discuss a possible examiner's amendment to reflect the patentable subject matter as argued in Applicant's 2/2/07 amendment. In particular, Mr. Rutten suggested including the subject matter of claim 7 in order to more adequately reflect the loading of methods from a suite file (see bottom of page 12 filed 2/2/07). In addition, it was suggested that the symbolic constant pool (see top of page 13 filed 2/2/07, also paragraph [0042] of the spec.) should be added. Finally, a potential 112 issue was discussed regarding the loading of classes. It was suggested that incorporation of limitations from claim 10, would provide support. Mr. Rutten read aloud the proposed amendment, and Mr. Yao agreed to the amendment. Mr. Rutten suggested that a similar amendment would be required for all indentent claims 12, 23, and 34.